

credit by the skin of my teeth, but only after taking the regular rise in interest costs which occurred at that time and an additional cost of 25 percent penalty. Some other small companies were squeezed out completely. During this same period, we had much less trouble from small banks. Small banks have no choice, they must, in but exceptional cases, do business with smaller companies and people.

Every bank merger eliminates at least one bank from the banking industry. Every time that a bank is eliminated the public has one less bank to which it can present a loan request. This does not affect large corporations, but for smaller businesses and individuals, it may mean the difference between obtaining a loan on the one hand and going under on the other hand.

S. 1698 should be defeated.

Congress should not, however, stop there. It should also repeal the Bank Merger Act of 1960.

Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, the sponsor of S. 1698, has stated: "The decisions of the Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases imposed on bank mergers the strict standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act and what apparently have become the equally strict standards of the Sherman Act. Clearly, these decisions have changed the situation on which the Bank Merger Act was based. If these cases had been decided before 1959, the Bank Merger Act would have been considered unnecessary."

Now that those cases have been decided, the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is as unnecessary today as it would have been in 1960 had those cases been decided before 1959.

Bank mergers should be measured by the same standards that mergers in other industries are measured by. It should be left to the Justice Department to determine initially whether a bank merger violates the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act and, upon the institution of suit by the Justice Department, to enjoin a bank merger or to divest banks which have already merged, it should be left to the Federal courts to decide whether the merger should be permitted or prohibited. Let the banking supervisory agencies regulate in those areas in which they are well equipped to regulate. But if competition is to be preserved and the public interest protected, do not give them the authority to permit banks to merge.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. PATMAN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

WATER CONSERVATION

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, in our land of abundance, it seems strange that customers in New York restaurants are not served water unless they ask for it.

This brings home to all of us, however, the need for conservation of our natural resources.

We are now taking two important steps: we are going to clean up this Nation's polluted streams, and we are going to make desalting feasible.

A recent article in the Sharon, Pa., Herald, hails these advances and notes the President's admonition that "aggressive conservation measures" are needed

and must be taken. Because the editorial will be of general interest, I insert it in the Record:

WATER CONSERVATION EFFORTS: WASHINGTON TAKES A HAND

The hearings on Hudson River pollution which opened Tuesday emphasize the increasingly active role of the Federal Government in water policy. U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner in announcing the hearings called the fouling of the Hudson "a shocking example of the destruction of resources that are vital to the health and welfare of our people." The U.S. Public Health Service said that the river now carries pollution from the equivalent of 10 million people.

The Federal Government's growing water role is largely a matter of lack of local responsibility and inability of States and localities to settle their differences over water use. By historical accident, great river systems of the continental United States are boundaries between various States, between the United States and Mexico, and in part between the United States and Canada. These rivers are thus subject to Federal jurisdiction, in whole or in part, under the commerce clause of the Constitution.

The Potomac River Basin, for example, runs into four States. Federal, State, and local officials are now working together toward a plan for rescuing the river from pollution and siltation. The planners, incidentally, oppose major reservoirs proposed by the Army Engineers, but encourage development of a network of small headwater impoundments.

The recent drought may prove to be not an unmixed disaster. For one thing, it gave urgency to the search for a cheap way to desalt water. Congress completed action last month on a bill to enlarge and extend the saline water program through fiscal 1972. President Johnson at the same time told Federal officials concerned with the research to proceed "as if you knew that you were going to run out of drinking water in the next 6 months."

The drought also made cooperation among States, localities, and the Federal Government more urgent. Congress took a modest step recently toward formulating a national water policy. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, approved by the President in July, gave statutory authority to the existing ad hoc water resources council created by President Kennedy 4 years ago.

President Johnson has outlined an emergency water program for the New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Pennsylvania area. This effort will not provide a permanent solution to the problems of the Delaware and Hudson basins, of course, to succeed at all it must be accompanied, the President said, by "aggressive conservation measures."

VIETNAM: THE DEMONSTRATIONS

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam which were held in several cities across our country this last weekend, including my own district in California, have generated feelings ranging from fervent support to outright hostility. They have stirred many comments and raised many questions. But let us take a minute to put the issue in perspective.

The right of protest, dissent, and free speech is, of course, a tradition of our society and a guarantee of our Constitution. Of no less importance is our tra-

ditional respect for and our reliance on a system of law and order. It seems almost needless to say, but perhaps it bears repeating at this time, that both have contributed to make our country what it is today; that neither can be compromised at the expense of the other; that both must be respected and sustained.

The war in Vietnam is most certainly a vital national issue. It both deserves and demands public thought and comment. But if this comment and participation is to be constructive it must be conducted in a lawful and a responsible manner. The very values of our form of government and our way of life require no less.

In commenting on the demonstrations, the Washington Post quite correctly stated this morning:

That small minority can be and ought to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety.

But, the terrible irony of the demonstrations this last week is, as the distinguished columnist and associate editor of the New York Times—Mr. James Reston—pointed out yesterday:

They (the demonstrators) are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they most fear. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it.

The awful paradox, as Mr. Reston goes on, is that—

The Communists reject the negotiations the demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Or as the Washington Post stated it:

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. * * * The demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong.

For the record is quite clear that Hanoi and the Vietcong, despite the American military buildup which has blunted their long-expected monsoon offensive and despite a very recent and intensive 10-week diplomatic effort on our part, have evidenced no interest at all in reducing the fighting or coming to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Reston's thoughtful article along with the Washington Post's timely comment for the careful consideration of our colleagues and all other concerned Americans.

I would also like to take this opportunity once again to state my belief that the United States measured response is the only reasonable alternative to Communist aggression and terror and subversion in Vietnam. I would like to state my strong and continued support for negotiations which can end the war and insure the people of South Vietnam self-

determination under United Nations guarantees at the earliest possible time. And I would like to urge, despite the Communist's continued intransigence and the apparent turning of the military tide, that we continue to mount the diplomatic offensive which is absolutely essential in peace is to be secured, independent choice guaranteed and the great task of building and rebuilding begun.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 17, 1965]

WASHINGTON: THE STUPIDITY OF INTELLIGENCE

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 16.—It is not easy, but let us assume that all the student demonstrators against the war in Vietnam are everything they say they are: sincerely for an honorable peace; troubled by the bombing of the civil population of both North and South Vietnam; genuinely afraid that we may be trapped into a hopeless war with China; and worried about the power of the President and the Pentagon and the pugnacious bawling patriotism of many influential men in the Congress.

A case can be made for it. In a world of accidents and nuclear weapons and damn fools, even a dreaming pacifist has to be answered. And men who want peace, defy the Government, and demonstrate for the support of the Congress, are not only within their rights but must be heard.

THE PARADOX

The trouble is that they are inadvertently working against all the things they want, and creating all the things they fear the most. They are not promoting peace but postponing it. They are not persuading the President or the Congress to end the war, but deceiving Ho Chi Minh and General Giap into prolonging it. They are not proving the superior wisdom of the university community but unfortunately bringing it into serious question.

When President Johnson was stubbornly refusing to define his war aims in Vietnam, and rejecting all thought of a negotiated settlement, the student objectors had a point, and many of us here in the Washington press corps and the Washington political community supported them, but they are now out of date. They are making news, but they are not making sense.

HEART OF THE PROBLEM

The problem of peace now lies not in Washington but in Hanoi, and probably the most reliable source of information in the Western world about what is going on there is the Canadian representative on the Vietnam International Control Commission, Blair Seaborn.

He files regularly to the North Vietnamese capital with the Polish and Indian members of that commission, and he is personally in favor of an honorable negotiated peace in Vietnam. He is a cultivated man and a professional diplomat. He knows all the mistakes we have made, probably in more detail than all the professors in all the teach-ins in all the universities of this country. What he finds in Hanoi, however, is a total misconception of American policy, and, particularly, a powerful conviction among Communist officials there that the antiwar demonstrations and editorials in the United States will force the American Government to give up the fight.

Not even the conscientious objectors on the picket lines in this country really believe that they have the power or the support to bring about any such result, but Hanoi apparently believes it and for an interesting reason.

Ho Chi Minh and the other Communist leaders in Hanoi remember that they defeated the French in Vietnam between 1950

and 1953 at least partly because of opposition to the Vietnam war inside France. The Communists won the propaganda battle in Paris before they won the military battle at Dienbienphu.

COUNTING ON PROTEST

Now they think they see the same surge of protest working against the Government in Washington, no matter what Mr. Seaborn says to the contrary. They have not been able to challenge American air, naval, or even ground power effectively since midsummer in South Vietnam, but they apparently still have the hope that the demonstrations against the Johnson administration in the United States will in the end give them the victory they cannot achieve on the battlefield.

So the Communists reject the negotiations that demonstrators in the United States want. They reject the negotiations the American Government has offered, and the demonstrators are protesting, not against the nation that is continuing the war but against their own country that is offering to make peace.

Not surprisingly, this is creating an ugly situation here in Washington. Instead of winning allies in the Congress to change the Johnson policy, the demonstrators are encouraging the very war psychology they denounce.

WRONG OBJECTIVES

Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, is now demanding that the administration pull up the antidraft movement "by the roots and grind it to bits."

Honest conscientious objectors are being confused with unconscious objectors, hangers-on, intellectual graduate school draft-dodgers, and rent-a-crown boobs who will demonstrate for or against anything. And the universities and the Government's policy are being hurt in the process.

So there are now all kinds of investigations going on or being planned to find out who and what are behind all these demonstrations on the campuses. It is a paradoxical situation, for it is working not for intelligent objective analysis of the problem, which the university community of the Nation is supposed to represent, not for peace, which the demonstrators are demanding, but in both cases for precisely the opposite.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

THE DEMONSTRATORS

The meaning of the demonstrations against the war in Vietnam will be understood in this country. The pressure groups mobilized by the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam are familiar here. All the expected elements were included, from Communists whose purpose is to destroy this country to earnest pacifists motivated by patriotic impulses.

The demonstrations revealed what the polls have long shown, that the determined popular opposition to the policy of the Government of the United States in South Vietnam has diminished to that irreducible dissenting minimum inevitable in a democratic society. That small minority can be allowed to be allowed to exercise all the liberties of free assembly and free speech that it needs to make its case known; and it ought to be denied only such means of publicizing its point of view as genuinely conflict with military security and public safety. The police, in most cities, seem to have dealt with the demonstrators and spectators with commendable restraint and patience and success. It is gratifying to know that we live in a country where the smallest minorities are free to disclose sentiments against the policies of the Government.

If the demonstrations did little mischief and caused little misunderstanding in this

country they may have done quite a bit of mischief abroad. The National Liberation Front, for many long months, has been counting on public opinion in the United States to accomplish what it has been unable to achieve by armed force. Its officials have been sustained by the belief that American public opinion will do for them what French public opinion did for the Vietminh. They are bound to see the straggling marchers, the ineffectual protest meetings, and the feeble demonstrations through prisms made out of their own narrow and restricted experience. They imagine that the United States is governed by a ruling elite or clique ruling as precariously as did Diem or the colonial puppets of France. And they fancy that such a government can be toppled by a handful of pickets and marchers.

So the demonstrators may have revived the hopes and prolonged the resistance of the Vietcong. The Communists who marched on Saturday, of course, will be delighted to have this happen. But it must be confusing to the liberals and real pacifists who sincerely desire the end of the war to realize that demonstrations such as theirs are the chief hope of the National Liberation Front for prolonging the war. It probably will take a few more months of fighting than it otherwise would have taken to bring the NLF to the conference table. This cannot be what most of the unsophisticated young people wish to accomplish.

VIETNAM PROTESTS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read in the paper this morning that President Johnson's pastor, the Reverend Dr. George R. Davis, in his sermon yesterday, strongly criticized Saturday's demonstrations in protest to the United States helping defend South Vietnam.

I am sure that most Americans, although they must defend the right of petition and peaceful assembly, will agree with Dr. Davis, or will at least consider these demonstrators as doing a great disservice to the cause of freedom. Meanwhile, as Dr. Davis pointed out, to uphold democracy, some free Nation has got to stand—as he said—at the ramparts.

Speaking as a Republican who supports the administration's policy, I abhor war—as does everyone else—but right now, we must put freedom first. I think that military assistance to South Vietnam is the shortest way and the best of lasting world peace.

STAT

COMMUNISTS GAIN: FREEDOM IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC—

ANOTHER LAOS IN THE MAKING?

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many Latin American editors meeting in San Diego apparently confirmed what I have been saying for some time about the results of the United States yielding to Communist demands after military intervention in the Dominican Republic, that is, that the strength of the Commu-

nists is greater now that it was prior to our intervention.

I quote from the following article contained in the Washington Post of October 18, 1965, written by Robert H. Estabrook:

Many (Latin American editors) believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Dominican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

Likewise, the editors apparently also "are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it—Communist subversion—throughout Latin America."

This is an amazing exposé of the shortcomings of our Alliance for Progress program.

It appears obvious that our entire Latin American policies need a thorough review and a complete shakeup. Likewise, it is obvious that our intervention in the Dominican Republic has been a complete failure based upon the announced purpose of the intervention, that is, to stop a Communist takeover. The result instead has been that the Communists have a voice in the government, that the anti-Communist military leaders have been forced out of the country as a part of a secret deal, that the strong anti-Communist press has not been permitted to start publication, although a pro-Communist paper "Patria is flourishing" and equally reprehensibly former President Juan Bosch has returned triumphantly to the country. Also the pro-Communists have apparently organized as Murder Incorporated as evidenced by the killing of Angel Severo Cabral, one of the outstanding conservative leaders. The Communists and the rebels are also trying to take over the university.

Is a Latin American Laos in the making as the result of our policies?

I insert the articles which I would suggest that all Members of Congress heed: [From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

TENSION UP AGAIN AFTER DOMINICAN RIGHTIST'S SLAYING

(By Clyde Sanger, Manchester Guardian)

SANTO DOMINGO, October 17.—Just when many people here were welcoming a significant relaxation after 6 months of strife, the murder of a leading rightwing politician has filled the Dominican situation with new tension.

Angel Severo Cabral, killed yesterday, was secretary general of the National Civic Union, whose candidate ran a poor second to Juan Bosch in the December 1962 presidential elections. Severo Cabral became Minister of the Interior when Bosch was overthrown 2 years ago and some people had recently spoken of him as a possible presidential candidate in the elections due next summer.

Relaxation had come with the rebel agreement to move the 1,400 troops which had held the 500-acre downtown section of this city in Bosch's name since the revolution began in April.

On Thursday these forces moved into a suburban barracks ready to be reintegrated into their old units. The next day the barricades were removed in the divided city and soldiers of the inter-American peace force—now reduced to 10,400 men—were being withdrawn to less conspicuous positions.

Ironically Severo Cabral's murder was a result of this unfreezing of the situation. On Friday his 26-year-old daughter visited the family apartment downtown to see what had

happened to the furniture during the 6 months the area had been cut off. She found a revolutionary living there who said he had been given the furniture by orders of Montes Arache, a rebel military leader.

Yesterday against the pleading of the rest of the family Severo Cabral went there to claim his property. An ugly quarrel began, aggravated by a large crowd which swarmed over from a week-long hunger strike demonstration against a peanut oil manufacturer in the main square.

When Severo Cabral decided to leave by a back alley he was shot in the shoulder by a machinegunner. While lying wounded in the back of a van, which was to have taken him to a hospital, he was killed by another man with a pistol. His daughter, who twice threw herself over his body to shield him, was slightly wounded, as was his wife.

(Cabral was buried in a brief service at Santo Domingo's national cemetery, according to news dispatches. Dominican authorities were reported to have ordered the arrest of persons believed implicated in the assassination of Cabral, a distant relative of deposed triumvirate President Donald Reid Cabral.)

(Cabral followers burned a jeep belonging to Radio Santo Domingo and shouted "down with communism." Meanwhile, the headquarters of another radio station, Radio Cristal, was machinegunned from a passing car, presumably by rightwing sympathizers, according to the dispatches.)

The fear of reprisals hangs heavy here today. There may even be danger to the life of Juan Bosch, who returned from exile 3 weeks ago and has been working in a small downtown office guarded by "constitutional" supporters.

Another incident that has raised tension is the struggle for control of the semi-autonomous University of Santo Domingo. During the heated days of the revolution some professors combined with most of the students to repudiate the university council and occupy the university site in the name of the revolution.

In attempting a comeback, the legal rector called a council meeting last weekend but it failed to gather a quorum. On Thursday, he announced he was charging the revolutionary group before the public prosecutor with usurpation of functions and illegal occupation.

Yesterday, at a second gathering of his council his supporters claimed there was the necessary 60 percent quorum while his opponents denied it. The building where the council met was patrolled by armed vigilante groups of rightwing support.

The provisional government of Hector Garcia Godoy, although in general sympathy with Bosch's constitutionality movement, has been tacitly supporting the old group at the university against the majority of the students.

Yesterday's council meeting could spark off action by students against Garcia Godoy's government. Until now the 5,000 students have been quietly attending classes. The campus is widely decorated with anti-American placards. What may restrain action is realization that rightwing tempers are also rising after the murder of Severo Cabral.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 18, 1965]

EDITORS SEE LATIN RED PROBLEM

(By Robert H. Estabrook)

SAN DIEGO.—Latin American editors view Communist subversion as the biggest problem in the Western Hemisphere, but they are not very enthusiastic about social reform as a means of coping with it.

Many also believe that the danger of Communist domination in the Republican Republic is greater today than at the time of the American intervention last April.

These are the principal conclusions invited

by the meeting of the Inter-American Press Association just completed here. Some 190 editors from North and South America were among the 400 participants.

EFFECTS OF U.S. POLICY

Talks with editors of many nationalities also lead to several other conclusions about the effect of American policy:

There is a consensus that the Dominican intervention was necessary to forestall another Cuba, although some are critical of method and others blame the United States for not finishing the job.

There is a general feeling that the recent critical speech by Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, raised unnecessary questions and had a mischievous effect because of his position as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. One Panamanian, however, commented that "FULBRIGHT agreed with me."

Opinion is sharply divided about the Selden resolution passed by the House of Representatives, which appeared to sanction unilateral military intervention to deal with Communist subversion. Some think that the effect of the resolution was exaggerated. Individual editors from Argentina, Honduras, and Mexico reported no special concern in their localities. But the resolution caused impassioned reactions in Chile, Colombia, Panama, and Peru, among other places.

VIEWS ON DOMINICAN ACTION

With respect to the Dominican intervention, one Ecuadorian editor remarked that many of the complaints could have been avoided "if President Johnson had just picked up the telephone and told a couple of Latin American Presidents what he was doing and why. He would not even have needed to ask them. Or he could have done the same thing by calling in a few ambassadors."

Others, however, feel that the United States has been too apologetic and should not have stopped short. They shrug off Latin American criticism as often motivated by domestic political concerns, noting the tendency of some officials to talk one way in private and another in public.

Dominican editors in particular complained that the Communists had used the truce period to consolidate forces and train saboteurs. Three newspapers closed by the rebels last April—El Caribe, Listin Diario, and Presna Libre—have not yet been enabled to reopen under the provisional government although an overly Communist organ, Patria, is flourishing.

Whether the peroccupation of Communist subversion rather than with reform is representative of general public opinion in Latin America is open to question.

CONSERVATIVE EDITORS

The IAPA includes such respected figures as Alberto Gainza Paz, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Buenos Aires which was closed by Peron, and Pedro Beltran, editor and publisher of La Prensa of Lima and former Prime Minister of Peru.

Nevertheless, Latin American editors who attended such conferences tend to be a pretty conservative lot. They vigorously applauded a speech by retired American Ambassador Ellis O. Briggs denouncing the emphasis on tax and land reform in the original concept of the Alliance for Progress as revolutionary and dangerous.

Some, however, may have been shy about expressing dissent. "If the man in the street gets the idea that the only people interested in helping him with his problems are the Communists," said one editor privately, "he will want to take their aid and Communist influence will be enhanced."

AGRICULTURAL NEED SEEN

A slightly different slant also came from Roberto Campos, Brazil's energetic Minister

of Planning, who contended that "Fidelismo" has lost some of its menace. The great challenge to the Alliance for Progress, he asserted, is to improve agricultural productivity, to absorb rural masses becoming urbanized into national political life, and to supplement economic aid with trade opportunities including higher prices for primary products.

But a tough speech by Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann was right in line with fears of Communist subversion. Mann also was applauded, although a few found him defensive or "not simpatico." The extraordinary lengths to which he went to reply to FULBRIGHT attested how really nettled the administration was by the criticisms, including those from sectors of the American press.

In effect, Mann denied that American policy on nonintervention has changed or that there is such a thing as the Johnson Doctrine. But he left dangling how the problem of subversion is to be countered speedily by collective means.

DANGER OF SUBVERSION

More emphatically, he insisted that the danger of subversion is real in "fragile" societies, and that any cooperation with the Communists is perilous. He quoted from President Kennedy to this effect.

What Mann really seemed to be saying is that reliance on reform through the democratic left is a mere slogan and is not enough to avoid subversion. The hemisphere must look for leadership to strong anti-Communists such as former President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela or to new forces emerging from the military, the church, and organized labor.

How well such an essentially ideological prescription will capture public imagination is another question. At any rate it did not satisfy a Texas guest who described himself as a cousin of Mann and who provided one of the few notes of levity by charging that both his cousin and Campos had their speeches written for them.

HOUSE MUST STAND FIRM AGAINST DICKEY-LINCOLN SCHOOL PROJECT

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it seems as though a Federal power project has more lives than an alley cat. Our colleagues in the House clearly expressed themselves on September 22 by voting 207 to 185 to approve the amendment by my distinguished colleague and friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] providing for a brief respite so that the Secretary of the Army might make a survey of the St. John River in Maine separate and apart from the Passamaquoddy project. This seemed reasonable to most of us because of the hasty and poorly conceived proposal which had been perpetuated upon the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

Now we see the sad spectacle of the proponents of this questionable project attempting to run roughshod over the will of the House of Representatives in the conference report on S. 2300 and force this first step toward Passamaquoddy down our collective throats. To accomplish that end, those proponents have been running around admitting that several of our votes will have to be switched. The Assistant Interior Secretary Kenneth Holm told a dinner group last Saturday night that the Interior De-

partment is "determined to see the Dickey hydroelectric power project on the St. John River become a reality." He said that he believed that some votes have been switched in the House.

Mr. Speaker, let us assure the Assistant Secretary that it is not up to the Department of the Interior to be determined but rather it is up to the Congress to determine whether a project will become a reality.

Several other proponents of this project attempted to tell some of us that the Dickey-Lincoln School project has been thoroughly studied; and, therefore, it is unnecessary to delay its approval any longer. Such a flagrant misuse of the truth I have not seen in my many years as a Member of this body. And, I might say, I am used to the Department of the Interior bending the truth because of my service on the Interior Committee. The Secretary of the Interior admitted during the testimony before the Public Works Committee that the Department of the Interior had not even discussed the possibility of marketing power from this project with any utility in New England. Its whole benefit-cost ratio hangs or falls on the ability of the nonexistent power marketing agency in New England to sell this block of power at the allocated price. This issue, obviously, needs more study.

Various witnesses before the committee question the data used by the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers on the study of alternative methods of generation. These data, obviously, need more study.

The combined electric companies of New England have an alternative proposal to supply the power needs of that region more cheaply and more efficiently than the Federal proposal. The companies' proposal was not given sufficient serious consideration. This proposition, obviously, needs more study.

The Secretary of the Interior, in his report to the Congress, said the Passamaquoddy project, which has been studied for half a century, needs more study. Therefore, it is much more reasonable to take the position that the hastily dissected appendage of Passamaquoddy, known as the Dickey-Lincoln School obviously, needs more study.

A recent issue of the magazine, Electric Light and Power, carried a very interesting article on this project. The title of this article is "Federal Power Casts Its Dark Shadow Over New England." So that each of our colleagues may have an opportunity to read this interesting statement, I am incorporating it in my remarks at this point:

If the proposed Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric project in northern Maine is rammed through Congress, then the lovely, first, benevolent and politically saturated Great Society leadership in Washington will have planted a seed calculated to sprout deep Federal intrusion into the local affairs of New England and probably additional Eastern States.

The Dickey project is perhaps less needed and more vulnerable to sound economic criticism than any Federal hydro project ever proposed, with the obvious exception of its lately sidetracked twin, the Passamaquoddy tidal project. So the fact that a project as

potentially wasteful of the people's money as Dickey should become the vehicle for getting the Federal power foot in the New England door clearly attests to the administration's appraisal of its arm-twisting power in Congress.

Easy justification for pushing Dickey, it might be added, was handed the administration in the form of unwary prodding by New England politicians, particularly those from Maine. In their persistent fretting that it was the Northeast's turn to get a Federal resource development project, these clamor boys tripped over the pitifully shortsighted view that Federal deficit spending for a development such as Dickey would somehow boost the area's economy.

A bit of background is needed to put Dickey in correct perspective. What study and planning the project underwent was in connection with Passamaquoddy, where its prime purpose originally was to provide pumping power to the Federal project. In conformity with established procedure, Interior Department last year submitted a report on the dual Quoddy-Dickey project to the affected Federal agencies and States for comment. Critical comments from agencies still displaying some professional integrity caved the roof in on Quoddy.

But extension of the Government's power realm and (coincidentally) New England's cry for a big Federal project were not to be denied. Deftly unhitched from Quoddy, Dickey was plunked on the President's desk last July by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, with a recommendation for independent development. No detailed studies had been made of the project to operate as a single unit, and no report on the revised proposal had been sent to affected Federal agencies and States for comment, as required by law. Yet the President immediately approved Mr. Udall's recommendation and submitted Dickey, appropriately blessed, to Congress. There it was tacked onto the already well-advanced omnibus rivers and harbors bill and was whisked through the Senate without even a hearing.

During a subsequent hearing before the House Public Works Committee, however, New England power company witnesses undressed Dickey for those who wanted to see. It was shown that this \$300-million, 794-megawatt development on the St. John River in the northern wilds of Maine would be an outright power project, with power accounting for nearly 98 percent of its benefits. It was shown, too, that Dickey power will not be low-cost power because if the project is kept within even the most liberal payout schedule, its output must bring a price higher than power produced by investor utilities in the area.

These New England utilities, incidentally, estimated they will achieve rate reductions of at least 30 percent by 1980 through current and future development of atomic power and pumped storage. Moreover, the companies' plans call for addition by 1969 of modern low-cost thermal plant, conventional and nuclear, which will provide an increase in generating capacity of more than 40 percent and will materially lower power costs in the area. Thus, it was shown that Dickey would be obsolete long before the earliest operational date (1971).

An astounding line of testimony came from Interior witnesses, who admitted that no power marketing plans for the project had been developed, and that the possibility of the sale of the power had not been discussed with any utility people in New England. Nor had any plan been drawn up for the location of transmission lines. Strange procedure, indeed, considering that some 90 percent of the power would have to be marketed outside of Maine.

What should have been a clinching factor against Dickey was the offer by a group of